

REMARKSProvisional Rejection of Claims 15, 16, 60, 61, 64, 66 and 67 Under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 15, 16, 60, 61, 64, 66 and 67 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over Claim 77 of copending Patent Application No. 08/796,164. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's statement that claims 15, 16, 60, 61, 64, 66 and 67 are not patentably distinct *over Claim 77* of copending Patent Application No. 08/796,164. However, a Terminal Disclaimer is being filed to expedite prosecution of the patent application.

Provisional Rejection of Claims 15, 16, 60, 61, 64, 66 and 67 Under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 15, 16, 60, 61, 64, 66 and 67 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over Claims 21 and 26-28 of copending Patent Application No. 08/616,371. A Terminal Disclaimer is being filed to overcome the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Carol A. Egner  
Carol A. Egner  
Registration No. 38,866  
Telephone (781) 861-6240  
Facsimile (781) 861-9540

Lexington, Massachusetts 02421-4799

Dated: *May 29, 2001*